



CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

Colonialism: An American Dilemma

The colonial problem stands at the top of almost every agenda for discussion of American foreign policy. The effect of widespread popular attention here and abroad has been to draw from responsible officials impassioned proclamations on Western policy. We are asked to define our policy on the colonial problem and to throw our weight behind popular revolutions.

In this setting it is tempting to take general and sweeping positions and to express an American doctrine on the rights of peoples everywhere to independence and self-government. This is particularly true because our own experience is so rich in its lessons and apparently pregnant with meaning. The fruits of attempts thus far to propound a dogma should serve, however, to give us pause, for the record of America's efforts to align itself squarely with either colonial or anti-colonial powers is sprinkled with as many failures as successes.

Nevertheless, we face new situations today and demands crowd in upon us for new and more vigorous policies. We are reminded that Senator Vandenburg with his emphasis on Europe and Western unity never disparaged the rights of colonial or former colonial peoples. Nationalism is on the march in Asia, the Middle East and Africa, and we implore one another to identify America with these movements rather than appearing to stand in their pathway. Unhappily the colonial problem is more intractable than these exhortations suggest. For at the same time we seek to end old imperialisms, a new and more demoniac expansionism threatens us. To meet it we must cleave to our trusted friends and allies with whom we have interests and military bases in common and strive to preserve a more stable world balance of power. Yet, in itself, this will not be enough. The present equilibrium of power will be upset unless we can

join with new forces in the so-called underdeveloped areas. We may say, therefore, that the United States faces the triple challenge of stemming the tide of Russian imperialism and world communism, uniting with other Western states, and drawing closer to non-Western peoples only recently emerging as independent states. In a manner of speaking, policy-makers must keep three balls in the air. This is the unenviable task of American statesmanship.

The pathos of our present position may be illustrated briefly from the history of recent weeks. First there was the statement on Goa, prompted doubtless by the zeal of European officers in the State Department to display a sense of community with Portugal. Everyone knows it provoked deep resentment in India and perhaps throughout much of Asia. Next came the expression of "sympathy" for Greek feelings in the Cyprus dispute by our Ambassador to Greece, Cavendish W. Cannon, which loosed a torrent of British protest. More recently the Dutch voiced dismay at Mr. Dulles' warm and friendly comments during a visit to the Indonesian Republic. Taken together, our efforts to cement ties of community and good will with one side in the colonial struggle threatened or ruptured the bonds of unity with the other. Possibly the one exception was Ambassador Dillon's speech supporting France's search for "liberal solutions" of her problems in North Africa, and even it was challenged by the moderate Tunisian nationalist leader Bourgiba.

Perceiving these problems, is there anything one can say about this perplexing picture which will offer some guidance to the juggler or policy-maker of whom we have spoken? Are there guidelines or principles we can enunciate to spotlight a few of the darker corners of this colonial problem? I believe there are. First, we must start with the pre-

VOL. XVI, No. 6 APRIL 16, 1956 \$3.00 per year; 15 cents per copy

sumption that the colonial problem is fraught with dilemmas with which we must learn to live. Nor will dogmas for or against colonialism waft them away. Solutions must be worked out case by case and as, for example, Tunisia is not identical with Algeria, policies must be shaped to meet individual needs. Secondly, timing is of the essence. The statement supporting Indonesia stirred up a hornet's nest because of Dutch-Indonesian tensions at this time over the trial of a former Chief of Dutch Military Intelligence charged with plotting to overthrow the Indonesian government, the conflict over Netherlands New Guinea, and the unilateral abridgment by Indonesia of certain financial and economic treaties. Thirdly, if any general solution can be found it rests in the coordinating of mutual interests, not in the wholesale sacrifice of one set of interests to another. In North Africa, French, American and African interests appear to coincide as respects "liberal solutions." Likewise in other regions the goal should be the harmonizing of interests. This calls for a judicious balancing of that force may be necessary to preserve colonial claims. Fourthly, it is one of the ironies of history arrangements in order not to perpetuate them but that their orderly liquidation may be achieved. Finally, conflicts of interest—as in the past between Britain and India or the Dutch and the Indonesians—may be swept along by powerful historical movements until one side emerges supreme. Here it may be necessary for American policy-makers to choose sides and in this way inevitably give offense. These facts need not preclude restraint. We wish that we could always act unambiguously in the interest of the colonial peoples, but we must understand that history and not American power is supreme. We cannot do everything we might wish.

K.W.T

STALIN—DEITY TO DEMON

OF ALL the developments in the post-Stalin era of Russia none is more striking than the deliberate effort of the new collective leadership in the Twentieth Congress to de-divinize Stalin and destroy the chief symbol of communism in the heart of the faithful.

In a secret meeting of the Congress the new party boss Khrushchev gave a vivid account of Stalin's paranoia, particularly in the closing days of his reign. No one who came into his presence, declared Khrushchev, could be certain of coming out alive. The liquidation by Stalin of the high army

command as far back as 1929 was declared to have been based upon fraudulent evidence. Another Communist leader, Mikoyan, went even further and hinted that Trotsky might be restored to the Soviet pantheon. The new flexibility of Soviet foreign policy, its attempt to enlist the neutralist nations of Asia in the "peace camp," and its acknowledgement that a nuclear war has become impossible for either side are no more significant than this official confession that the man who was worshipped so long as a very god was a beast of diabolical proportions, who ruled by fear and terror.

The question is what motives prompted this reversal, but perhaps a more important question is what consequences may possibly flow from it. The motives for such an astounding reversal are naturally multiple. The army oligarchy, grown steadily stronger since Stalin's death, seemed to have exacted this de-divinization as the price of its support of the government. The army's part in the reversal is evident in the prominence given to the rehabilitation of the purged army leaders in Khrushchev's exposures. Probably the new leadership was also anxious to disassociate itself from the odium of Stalin's tyranny, though that was not easy since they were all involved in it. Every one of the leaders who now denigrate Stalin was on record with previous extravagant encomiums. There is a possibility that the denegation of Stalin was a collective decision, designed to prevent a new dictator from arising. There is an obvious effort to return to Lenin's celebrated "democratic centralism," though this is perhaps impossible, for the Party has meanwhile become a tremendous engine of government. It cannot allow complete democracy in the whole expanse of the Party. It must limit freedom to the oligarchy. The question is whether a freedom with no broader base can long endure and whether a dictatorial regime must not finally accept a dictator at the apex of the oligarchical structure. The Roman oligarchy could not be at peace until Augustus imposed unity upon it. This may be an instructive analogy to Russia.

The consequences of this revolutionary step are even more important than the possible motives for it, and opinions about the consequences are even more speculative. There are some hopeful signs in the development. The post-Stalin era has recovered Lenin's tactical flexibility but it has paid the price of shaking the dogmatic fanaticism which Lenin combined with tactical flexibility to give communism such a tremendous force. Now that the

dogmatic fanaticism seems to be disintegrating and the symbols of the faith are shaken, there is a bare possibility of disintegration in the whole dogma.

The riots in Stalin's home state of Georgia, the embarrassment in the satellite nations, the Party rebellions in East Germany and other nations against the little dictators, placed in their office by Stalin, and the quaint complaints of even the American *Daily Worker* against the reversal, are all signs of confusion in the Communist camp. Political cohesion must be achieved either democratically or by fanatic authority and by fear of authority. One may doubt whether the two systems can be combined and a social system exist half-slave and half-free. If this proves impossible it means the quick disintegration of Communist power.

We must expect communism to be a more, rather than less, formidable opponent and foe for decades to come. We cannot congratulate ourselves that our strength has brought about all these changes. But there is some validity in nourishing an ultimate hope that this dangerous foe will cease to be as dangerous as he now is. The Communist movement may, for all we know, be gradually coordinated to the mutualities of the community of nations. But such developments, if at all possible, belong to another century. Whatever hopes we have cannot seriously change the burdens and anxieties which we must face in the coming decades of this century. Our foe has discarded the heavy army of tyranny. In his new armor he challenges us more formidably than ever before. This may no longer be pure tyranny. But it is still collectivism, which denies human freedom. And this collectivism is still very attractive to the peoples of Asia and Africa, who are tempted to exchange organic collectivism of feudal communities for the more grievous technical collectivism of communism under the illusion that they can achieve justice in the exchange. R.N.

THE EXTENSION OF THE "CRISIS"

THIS JOURNAL first came into existence as an attempt on the part of a small group of people to relate the Christian faith to the days of crisis prior to the United States' entry into World War II. Its sponsors felt that the U. S. had an obligation to be involved in the struggle already taking place on the Continent. Since that time, the journal has remained alive because it is clear that there has been and will be no let-up in the "crisis situation" in which we live, and that the Christian faith must always be related to the perennial crisis of our existence before God.

Throughout the fifteen year life-span of this

journal, the crisis has been interpreted chiefly in political and economic terms. There has been a consistent attempt to spell-out some of the implications for faith and from faith of America's national and international life. But save for exceptional articles or editorials which broke the pattern, most of the attention has been directed to the political and economic arena.

It is well known that the word "crisis" means not only a critical time, a time of testing, but that it also, and even more fundamentally, means "judgment." A crisis is a time of judgment, and the judgments of God are not limited simply to the political and economic scene, though they may be most readily discernible there. The judgments of God extend throughout the whole length and breadth of our culture, so that it can be said that there is no aspect of life which is immune from his searing and healing concern. And it is now the intention of the Editorial Board of *Christianity and Crisis* to give increasing attention to these other areas of life in which the "crisis" is manifest. Since the judgment of God is always "judgment to save," we must be prepared to find him speaking in and through voices or groups which do not consciously represent him, and we must be prepared to find his word being distorted in and through voices or groups which do consciously represent him.

In the light of these facts, the collective editorial eye of this journal plans to scan a wider horizon than has been done in the past. We shall try to see what is being said to us not only in politics and economics, but in the modern novel, the contemporary theatre, the world of art, and the very important mass-media of television, radio and motion picture. Our initial forays in these directions will of necessity be modest, but they will be directed by the conviction that God has a concern for all of life and that we must be prepared to discern his hand at work in the most unlikely places. We are sure that there are times when his hand is more creatively present in the so-called "secular" realm than it is in the more conventional channel of revelation, and that a Christian journal must be alive to this likelihood.

The new format of the journal stands as a kind of symbol for this extension of concern. New typography and design, a different spacing of articles, occasional art work—these things are introduced not only to increase "readability," but in an attempt to relate form and content with greater integrity. We will need the help and advice of our readers as we seek to make the changes in content commensurate with the changes in form.

R.M.B.

Another Look at the Arab-Israeli Problem

HERMAN F. REISSIG

IN THINKING about Israel, one must, it seems to me, always begin with the historic hope of Jews for a return to Jerusalem. Not shared by all Jews, the longing has, nevertheless, been intense and widespread since the dispersion. Zionist leaders must surely know as well as anyone that no legal claim to Palestine can be based on the fact it was once the home of the Jews. Too many other peoples have lived there and too much history has intervened. But the historical and emotional affinity cannot be denied. Insofar as Jews through the centuries have dreamed of a Jewish homeland, they have dreamed of Palestine and of no other place. This elemental fact seems to some of us non-Jews to make almost absurd the suggestion, now frequently heard, that if a Jewish state was desirable it could have been established in Africa or some other part of the world where it would not have been necessary to infringe on other peoples' rights. On almost any Sabbath Jews might hear again the words of the 126th Psalm: "Restore our fortunes, O Lord, like the watercourses in the Negeb"—and many another scriptural expression of the living link between Judaism and Palestine. Easy enough for Christians and Arabs to say, "They could have gone elsewhere!" The powerful wanting was directed to Palestine and, while the wanting does not constitute a claim, it just about rules out any other part of the world as a homeland possibility. This is a first and important fact.

The Balfour declaration gave to the Zionist movement an impetus which constitutes a second basic fact of which account must be taken. Whatever may be said about the circumstances or meaning of the declaration, it gave to Zionism a new and powerfully propulsive force. "His Majesty's Government looks with favor . . ." is among the most potent statements ever made by a government. Once the statement was made and once the resulting stream of Jews toward Palestine had begun to flow, there was in existence an almost irresistible movement toward a full-fledged Jewish state in Palestine.

A third fact, and centrally relevant fact, is the attempted, and almost successful, annihilation of Jews in central Europe under Hitler. It is not too much to say that no one who does not feel in his inner being the agony of that murderous onslaught on Jewry is in a position to give Zionism its due of

appreciation. Coming as a climax to centuries of persecution in many countries, can not Christians understand the depth and passion of the resolution to create a home and a refuge that would be finally and permanently immune to the anti-Semitic virus? Where are Jews today entirely safe from irrational discriminations, with the possibility of overt attacks on them always in the background? Not in the United States! Not in Soviet Russia! Not in the Arab countries! As for central Europe, to whatever extent anti-Semitism may have been suppressed, is it difficult to understand the revulsion against living anywhere near Dachau? To place the "anti-Semitic" label on all who oppose Israel and Zionism is to be grossly unjust. What is more to the point is the observation that, with some exceptions, the anti-Zionists have not been in the forefront of the struggle against anti-Semitism. There is, in much of the opposition to Israel among non-Jewish Americans, a quality of bitterness, or, at least, such absence of sympathetic understanding as to make one wonder if, anti-Semitism aside, these opponents have ever felt in their bones the sufferings of their Jewish fellowmen. It is one thing to assert that injustice has been done to Arabs and to demand relief and resettlement for the Arab refugees; it is something a little different to do this in the context of a general discrediting of Zionism and Israel. A just judgment must, to repeat, take into full account the immeasurable affliction visited upon the Jewish people in our time, with its understandable result in a resolution to create at least one nation where the ugly monster cannot be even conceived. If this be dismissed as "emotional thinking," let us drop from the Biblical prophets all the emotion-packed pleas for compassion and demands for justice—and see what we have left!

Hostility to the Modern West

Turning now to the Arab world, it is, I think, erroneous to say that the number one obstacle to its reconciliation to Israel is in the nine hundred thousand Arab refugees. Arab refugees did not incite the Arab world to make war on Israel in 1948. Most of them are a consequence of the war. Nor was the original Arab hostility due solely to the loss of some Arab land and the feared displacement of larger numbers of Arabs from the Palestinian area. The hostility has deeper roots. "There can be little doubt," says Gerson D. Cohen,

Mr. Reissig is International Relations Secretary for the Congregational Christian Church. In 1954 he visited Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and Israel.

"that much of the Arab intransigence to the state of Israel is a transference of its keen hostility to the modern Western world." The history of Arab-Western relations since World War I provides strong evidence for this view. With the break-up of the Turkish empire in 1918, the West moved in on the Arab countries. The rule of Britain and France was about as popular as foreign rule usually is. But it was not simply political overlordship that caused trouble. The whole Arab way of life, including its theology, responded with pain and alarm to the vigorous impact of Western culture. If the more enlightened Arabs gladly accepted Western educational and other influences, most of the Arab world sensed a deep threat. To Arab feudalism and general social backwardness, Western culture certainly was a threat. To some of the Islamic ethics and theology the West also brought a challenge. The growing discomfort of the Arab world, from its worst to its best, is understandable.

If additional evidence of the anti-Western factor is needed, one need only observe the violence of the current campaigns to oust Western nations from the Middle East, from northwest Africa to Jordan and beyond. But now, suddenly, there is set down in the midst of the Arab world a new nation, thoroughly Western in its orientation and way of life. It is a nation, moreover, which without Western support could not remain alive. This is the real threat of Israel. Not so much that it takes over Arab land and displaces some Arabs, but that Israel is both an alien and a vital society in an area that either does not wish to change or wishes to change in its own way and at its own pace! If this is not the whole of the story, it requires only a little knowledge and understanding to see that it is an important part of it.

One doubts if Zionist leaders of yesterday appreciated this problem. Zionists see it now, and are more than willing that Israel should be a spur and challenge to Arab society. Nevertheless, it is a problem for the Arabs and one not easily handled. In dealing with it, Israel needs to become, if not less Western, more truly a part of the Middle East. And the West, particularly the United States, must prove in action that it cares as much for the welfare of the Arabs as for the preservation of Israel.

The adjustment of Israelis and Arabs is now further complicated by what appears to be the ambition of Egypt to occupy a hegemonic place in the Arab world. Egypt would like the King of Jordan to come to Egypt, but Egypt will not go to Jordan. And Jordan, as if to demonstrate an autonomous anti-Western policy, dismisses the long-time British commander of its Arab legion. To

many Western observers it seems a little strange that the Naguib government, so intelligent and progressive in its domestic policy, should be willing to risk war for the destruction of Israel. Surely, neither the memory of the 1948 defeat nor compassion for the refugees explains this belligerent intransigence! The more likely explanation is an ambition to be the leader in a kind of Napoleonic unification and liberation campaign in the Middle East.

The Refugee Problem

Perhaps the first thing to say about the refugee problem—because it is not often said—is that there are Arab refugees and Jewish refugees. Thousands of *bona fide* Jewish refugees are now citizens of Israel. Where would they have been able to go if Israel had not been there? Other thousands of Jews can no longer be happy, even if they are tolerated, in Europe and in Arab countries, and they wish to go to Israel. We ought to make sure Palestine is not closed off as a refuge for Jews while we concentrate on resettling the Arab refugees. Debating the reasons for the mass exodus of Arabs from Palestine may seem almost a waste of time when what is needed is a practical solution of an existential, and intolerable, situation. But a solution is impeded by the unwillingness of both sides to accept responsibility for the exodus. "It's your problem!" say the Israelis to the Arabs. "It's your responsibility!" say the Arabs to the Israelis, to the United Nations and to the United States. Actually the responsibility is probably about evenly distributed. There can be little question that the Jews, in their fierce zeal to make room for themselves and their kindred, were not overly sensitive to the human rights of Arabs living in Palestine. Some cases of overt attacks on Arabs we know about, and they are admitted by Israel. There is certainly much more in this unhappy record that is not admitted. Neither pressing need nor might makes right, and Israel cannot escape a share of the blame. On the other side, it is a simple fact of military action that no invading army wants to be hampered by the presence of large numbers of non-combatants, even if they are sympathetic to the invasion. We may, therefore, take it for granted that the invading Arab armies did, despite the later denials, order Arabs in Palestine to leave their homes and go back behind the lines to Arab countries. That many thousands responded and were unable to return is not, in any immediate sense, the fault of Israel. There is here, then, a joint responsibility.

Israel has taken some ameliorative actions, such as helping to unite some 6,000 Arab families separated by war and accepting as citizens about 35,000 Arabs who had infiltrated back into Israel. She has also offered to pay compensation for lands formerly occupied by Arabs and has released \$15 million in the refugees' blocked bank accounts. With the help of loans from the West, Israel will no doubt be ready to make further contributions toward the huge expense of resettlement. At least, this we could rightfully ask. To ask her to permit the return of any considerable number of those now living in the camps is to ask that she be indifferent to the health and safety of the new nation. In the absence of what would have to be a complete pacification of the whole area and a condition of friendship between Arabs and Jews, large numbers of returning Arabs would certainly be a fifth column, and more harm than good would be done.

A Possible Solution

In a letter to the *New York Times*, James G. McDonald has offered what seems to be a sensible and possible solution for ending the refugees' plight. He bases his plan on a program presented in 1945 by Herbert Hoover, who then suggested the resettlement of large numbers of Palestine Arabs in Iraq. (I do not know where Mr. Hoover's predominant sympathy lies in the present situation. He has, at any rate, not identified himself with pro-Zionist groups.) Mr. McDonald begins with the fact that Iraq, Jordan, and Syria "have sufficient and uncultivated land—some of which would require irrigation—to absorb comfortably all the refugees and make them productive citizens." He proposes the creation of an Arab colonization corporation, controlled by Arabs. The necessary capital, running into many hundreds of millions of dollars, could, Mr. McDonald thinks, be secured from compensation paid by Israel for the land and properties of the refugees, allocations from the United Nations, grants and loans from the United States and Great Britain, and grants from foundations and welfare agencies.

Since both the United States and Great Britain have announced their readiness to make grants and loans looking toward a basic settlement, and since the United Nations would probably prefer to make a one-time sizeable investment, instead of spending millions of dollars annually in relief work that brings a settlement no nearer, it does not seem improbable that the necessary money could be found. Mr. McDonald suggests that the Arabs, while distrusting Western-controlled enterprises,

might be induced to agree to a colonization undertaking controlled by themselves. Arab control of resettlement, plus the fact that "the resettlement of hundreds of thousands of refugees would enormously increase economic values in those Arab countries that absorbed them" might, this experienced observer believes, counterbalance the fact that resettlement in Arab countries would imply Arab acceptance of Israel as a permanent neighbor.

Such a plan does, at least, take into account some of the realities of the situation. Certainly no plan that calls for the return of the refugees to their former homes or for a Western-controlled resettlement in Arab countries has a chance of being put into effect. Lament over past injustices, real or partly-real, will do little good. Neither side can have what it presently demands. If Israel should refuse to permit any boundary adjustment and decline to make substantial compensation for Arab property and if the Arabs continue to insist on the original United Nations recommendations for the division of Palestine and on the return of all the refugees, war must seem inevitable. One hopes that neither side imagines that war would bring it to the desired goal.

In Beirut, in the latter part of May, representatives of the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council will meet for another discussion of the Arab refugee problem. Meeting in one of the major Arab centers of the political struggle, it will, to put it mildly, be difficult for these churchmen to give full weight to the facts and considerations which Israeli leaders consider important. And, while many of the churchmen are well acquainted in Arab lands, few of them have visited Israel. One can only hope that the desire to alleviate the long drawn-out suffering of Arab refugees will not increase what is already a rather one-sided involvement of church leaders in the political struggle.

WE ARE DEEPLY INDEBTED to Gregor Goethals for her creative work in helping to plan and execute our "new look." If our readers feel that the integrity of our journal has been increased through the achievement of a more adequate unity of form and content, Mrs. Goethals deserves much of the credit.

—The Editors

MOVIES

THE HIDDEN TALENT

THOSE WHO saw Frank Sinatra portray a dope addict, and heard a nervous musical score suggest the powers of heroin, felt that they had been shocked by a plunge into a world entirely different from their own. But it was the book, *The Man with the Golden Arm*, not the movie, which attacked the values of their world. Nelson Algren wrote a story about guilt and atonement; but guilt is uncomfortable, atonement hard to come by. It is a tribute to Hollywood's ingenuity that it was able to take such unpromising material and assemble a myth designed to flatter, not upset, the values of its audience.

Algren's characters are the disinherited, with no future and a guilty past; Hollywood's hero overcomes his venial past and rises to claim a middle-class future, symbolized by a display-window kitchen, containing a dishwashing machine, but lacking a hypodermic. The movie accepts our popular Manichaeian universe, in which there is some evil and some men have bad habits, but no man sins. Hollywood, through its adaptation of the book, supplies a myth in which its audience can readily identify itself with the needs of the hero for encouragement and sympathy.

Sinatra plays beautifully the frailties of Frankie Machine, who kicks the dope habit (under the influence of a good doctor) but later falls back into the demonic rhythms of Chicago, near Northside. Chicago is the world which had once overwhelmed him: a neurotic wife who had tricked him into marriage, the gambler Schwiefka, and the dope peddler Louis who was always nearby—but he is saved from it all by the understanding of his girl, Molly-O. His wife is buried, and the future is his—and Molly-O's.

Seldom has Hollywood more effectively rinsed away guilt from a story. The original Frankie went to jail for a crime, not for a habit; he was a man guilty of betraying friends, not just in need of them; he was guilty of murder, not simply victimized by a wife who committed manslaughter. In the book Bednar is the Police Captain whose memory for crime, guilt, and corruption had earned him the nickname of Record Head, but Hollywood, quite consistently, excises this Recording Angel from the story. There is no need for recording past guilt in the movie, only need to escape a harrowing experience by entry into a new life. The movie Frankie is a venial sinner with whom one can sympathize. He is a weak man, oppressed like you and me by the weight of circumstance. No harm

is done in seeing him through the fascinations and agonies of a habit and in celebrating at last a victory won by personal courage and the warmth and loyalty of a woman.

The movie reflects the modern sense of the unendurable power of the world which brings a man to the breaking point—a world, however, in which a person is not implicated by guilt. Thus he may seek from the good God, not forgiveness but pity, not atonement but understanding, not judgment but encouragement of that hidden talent which will extricate him from the surroundings of the past and earn for him a middle-class future.

The theme of the hidden talent is a common one today in the most successful of movies and TV drama. In the TV show "Joey" a dull youth, unbeknownst to his family, sings well. Frankie, in "The Man with the Golden Arm," has a gift with the drums. The man with the talent needs only encouragement (though he needs that desperately). The combination of talent and encouragement allows a man to ascend from an evil world to a better one. By some such alliance the Manichaeian world turns into a middle-class fairy tale.

The hidden talent in the weak man has a number of advantages for the myth. First, the audience is not disturbed by the presence of an assured virtuosity which would render its sympathy superfluous. Second, any man might have a hidden talent, thus encouragement of the weak man is self-encouragement. Third, a talent appeals to the lazy who prefer gifts inborn rather than virtuosity achieved.

But, to the Frankie of the novel, life as a drummer is only a daydream, not only because he is too deeply involved in the habit of dope and in the near Northside to become another kind of man, but because a talent, after all, is utterly irrelevant to the problem of guilt. Some men have gained a future through a talent, but no man has covered a guilty past by playing the drums.

Algren created a moral world in which there is despair, not simply because there is no future but because no future can blot out the past. In this novel there may be found every kind of personal betrayal but, at least, not that betrayal perpetrated by the successful when they believe that their guilt is blotted out by their success. Thus the vow of an addict—"this is my last fix"—and the daydreams of all the bums, strippers and lushes that populate the dives of the city are pathetic, not only because the weight of evil is immense, the vitium of sin telling, but because the vow that lies precariously across the future, even if it were successfully fulfilled, cannot atone.

WILLIAM F. MAY

WORLD CHURCH: NEWS AND NOTES

Theologian Attacks Apartheid Policy

CAPETOWN, S. Africa (RNS) — Dr. B. B. Keet, head of the theological seminary at nearby Stellenbosch and leading theologian of the Dutch Reformed Church, has attacked the South African government's apartheid (segregation) policy and criticized his church for supporting it in his recently published book, *Whither South Africa?*

Die Burger, Capetown's nationalist newspaper, called the book "a frontal attack on apartheid in the light of Christian principles." It said the volume is certain to cause "a great upheaval" in the church and in political circles.

Dr. Keet condemns all forms of apartheid as "an escape from our Christian duty which requires us to live not only with like-thinking people of a like development but also and above all to include the underprivileged, to bear their burdens and to help them attain human dignity."

He charges that the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa is "out of step" with all other Christian denominations in its approach to race relations. The theologian chides the church for attempting to justify its stand on Biblical grounds. "Let us acknowledge openly," Dr. Keet states, "that Holy Writ draws no dividing lines or walls between the races of the world, either in the Old or the New Testament. According to the Scriptures, everyone is my neighbor, and if this is so I must associate with him."

The theologian does not propose the immediate abolition of segregation. As an interim solution, he suggests a policy of "partial apartheid" provided it is "instituted only as a temporary, not a permanent, measure. It would be an idealistic dream to suppose that all discrimination must disappear immediately and make way for full political equality between white and non-white," he writes. "But the door must not be closed by an apartheid policy and attitude which permits no possibility of improvement."

"Among Europeans there must be a change

of heart which will welcome non-Europeans as allies in the fight against everything which threatens our Christian civilization. Among non-Europeans the first essential will be exercise of patience and perseverance since they have a long way to go before reaching such a state of maturity that granting of rights to all will not be dangerous."

Counterattack

Meanwhile, Rev. W. A. Landman, the Dutch Reformed Church's secretary and chairman of its race relations bureau, has launched a "one-man crusade" to achieve total segregation in South Africa.

Mr. Landman began the crusade immediately after the publication of Dr. Keet's book.

Addressing a crowded meeting at Caledon, near here, Mr. Landman said that "South Africa's only hope of solving its racial problem lay in territorial separation." Calling such separation the "only practical and moral solution to South Africa's problem" he urged that it be approached "objectively and free of panic, emotion, hatred and bitterness."

In working towards complete segregation, Mr. Landman declared, "we must make the maximum use of the best brains South Africa can produce. In the process of segregation, the native will need our help as we need his," he said. "The church and our missionary work will have to help overcome hatred and create good will between races."

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

537 WEST 121 ST. • NEW YORK 27 • N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND JOHN C. BENNETT, *Chairmen*
WAYNE H. COWAN, *Managing Editor*
ARNOLD W. HEARN, *Assistant Editor*

M. SEARLE BATES WALDO BEACH AMOS WILDER
ROBERT McAFEE BROWN F. ERNEST JOHNSON
JOSEPH SITTLER HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER FRANCIS P. MILLER J. OSCAR LEE
UMPHREY LEE WILLIAM F. MAY ROGER L. SHINN
KENNETH W. THOMPSON EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER JOHN A. MACKAY
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH

Detroit Public Library
Book Receiving Dept.
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich.

27462 11-56